UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/779,985	02/17/2004	David Huang	EQUUS-106A	8892
Bruce B. Brunda STETINA BRUNDA GARRED & BRUCKER Suite 250 75 Enterprise Aliso Viejo, CA 92656			EXAMINER	
			BROADHEAD, BRIAN J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3664	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/14/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/779,985	HUANG, DAVID
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	BRIAN J. BROADHEAD	3664
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tinwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>9-3-</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under the practice under the practice.	s action is non-final. ince except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 24-34 and 36 is/are pending in the all 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 24-34 and 36 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	cepted or b) objected to by the land drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is objected to by the land drawing(s) is objected to be land drawing(s).	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documen 2. Certified copies of the priority documen 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documen application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list.	ts have been received. ts have been received in Application trity documents have been receive tu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate

Application/Control Number: 10/779,985 Page 2

Art Unit: 3664

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 24-34, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alfaro et al., 5491418, in view of Mitcham et al, EPA420-R-00-017
- 3. Alfaro et al. disclose connecting a protocol specific connector to a handheld diagnostic device, identifying physical features of the connector, the physical features directly identifying at least one diagnostic standard associated with the vehicle under test and being unrelated to vehicle information other than the identification of the standard, identifying communications protocols associated with the standard, retrieving configuration data associated with the communication protocol, and configuring the diagnostic device in accordance with the retrieved configuration data on line 58, on column 1, through line 2, on column 2; the step of identifying physical features of the connector includes identifying the connector connectivity configuration and identifying the connector pin configuration on lines 40-50, on column 3, and lines 24-28, on column 3; the step of identifying physical features of the connector comprises performing a continuity test to identify whether continuity exists between specific pins of the connector on lines 55-60, on column 3; determining if the connector is a standard OBD-2 connector on line 2, on column 3, SAE J 1962 is the specification for OBD-2 DLCs;

Application/Control Number: 10/779,985

Art Unit: 3664

the method is performed with the device disconnected from the vehicle diagnostic port on lines 55-64, on column 3, here it states the connector provides the configuration information and connection to the vehicle is not required; a CPU 78, memory on lines 31-32, on column 8; a protocol specific connector for connecting the device to the diagnostic port (10); the connector having features recognizable by the CPU as corresponding to at least one associated comm. protocol on lines 1-35, on column 3; a look up table identifying diagnostic configuration data on lines 25-34, on column 8; and the CPU configuring the diagnostic device in accordance with the configuration data on lines 45-67, on column 6.

Page 3

- 4. Alfaro et al. do not disclose the at least one communication protocol being identified based upon identification of the two pins connected there between and serially polling the OBD systems using each of the plurality of communication protocols until successful communication is established between the device and the vehicle OBD, or this is accomplished with a sequencer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to multiple circuit elements 22, which would include jumpers, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. Alfaro et al. already discloses examining electrical characteristics between pins to determine the communication protocol. Using multiple circuit elements (22) is just an obvious modification that would allow even more communication protocols to be identified.
- 5. Alfaro et al. disclose the limitations as set forth above. They do not disclose serially polling the OBD systems using each of the plurality of communication protocols

Application/Control Number: 10/779,985 Page 4

Art Unit: 3664

until successful communication is established between the device and the vehicle OBD, or this is accomplished with a sequencer. Mitcham et al. teaches that the OBD-2 regulations adopted by the federal government require automatic hands-off determination of the communication protocol on page 6. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teaching of Mitcham et al. in the invention of Alfaro et al. because it would make the device of Alfaro et al. comply with government regulations.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 9-03-08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The device that Alfaro refers to when talking about the device or vehicle specific circuit element could just as easily be used to indicate that the diagnostic device is attached to a certain protocol device. The "device type" disclosed could easily just be an indication of the protocols the vehicle diagnostic system uses. This would be an obvious modification with no unexpected results and would prevent having a different connector for every type of vehicle.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRIAN J. BROADHEAD whose telephone number is (571)272-6957. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday or Tuesday through Friday.

Application/Control Number: 10/779,985 Page 5

Art Unit: 3664

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Khoi Tran can be reached on 571-272-6919. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Brian J. Broadhead/

Examiner, Art Unit 3664